

1 JOHN M. NEUKOM (SBN 275887)
johnneukom@quinnmanuel.com
2 JORDAN R. JAFFE (SBN 254886)
jordanjaffe@quinnmanuel.com
3 ANDREW M. HOLMES (SBN 260475)
drewholmes@quinnmanuel.com
4 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP
5 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, California 94111
6 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff FORTINET, INC.
8

9 SEAN C. CUNNINGHAM (SBN 174931)
sean.cunningham@dlapiper.com
10 KATHRYN RILEY GRASSO (SBN 211187)
kathryn.riley@dlapiper.com
11 DAVID R. KNUDSON (SBN 265461)
david.knudson@dlapiper.com
12 DLA PIPER LLP (US)
401 B Street, Suite 1700
13 San Diego, CA 92101-4297
Telephone: 619.699.2700
Facsimile: 619.699.2701

14 TODD S. PATTERSON (*pro hac vice*)
todd.patterson@dlapiper.com
15 DLA PIPER LLP (US)
401 Congress Avenue, Suite 2500
16 Austin, Texas 78701-3799
Telephone: 512.457.7000
Facsimile: 512.457.7001

17 Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaim
18 Plaintiff SOPHOS INC. and Counterclaim
19 Plaintiff SOPHOS LTD.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

FORTINET, INC., a corporation

Case No. 3:13-cv-05831-EMC

vs.
Plaintiff,

SOPHOS, INC., a corporation, MICHAEL
VALENTINE, an individual, and JASON
CLARK, an individual.

Defendants.

**STIPULATION AND PROPOSED
ORDER TO STAY CASE SCHEDULE
FOR TWENTY (20) DAYS**

SOPHOS INC. and SOPHOS LTD.,
corporations,

Counterclaim Plaintiffs,

vs.

FORTINET, INC., a corporation,

Counterclaim Defendant.

1 WHEREAS Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendant Fortinet, Inc. ("Fortinet") and Defendants
2 and Counterclaim-Plaintiffs Sophos Inc. and Sophos Ltd. (collectively, "Sophos") have disputed
3 Sophos' responses to certain requests for inspection propounded by Fortinet related to former Fortinet
4 employees, who are currently Sophos employees;

5 WHEREAS, on June 25, 2015, prior to a discovery hearing on two joint discovery letters,
6 Sophos agreed to allow Fortinet access to devices and images of the former Fortinet employees'
7 devices pursuant to the terms of Stipulation and Order being filed with Magistrate Judge Ryu;

8 WHEREAS, Fortinet needs time to inspect, investigate, and analyze the data from these
9 forensic images for evidence related to its claims;

10 WHEREAS, given the foregoing, the parties agreed to a stay of the case schedule for twenty
11 (20) days;

12 WHEREAS, Magistrate Judge Ryu directed the parties to file a joint status report to update the
13 Court on these inspections by July 16, 2015. *See* Docket No. 161.

14 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by the parties that:

15 The parties respectfully request the case schedule be stayed for twenty (20) days, until July 16,
16 2015.

1 DATED: June 26, 2015

2
3 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
4 SULLIVAN, LLP

5 By /s/ John M. Neukom
6

7 John M. Neukom (Bar No. 275887)
8 johnneukom@quinnemanuel.com
9 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
10 San Francisco, California 94111-4788
11 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
12 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff FORTINET, INC.
14

15 DATED: June 26, 2015

16 DLA PIPER LLP (US)

17 By /s/ Sean C. Cunningham
18

19 SEAN C. CUNNINGHAM, Bar No. 174931
20 sean.cunningham@dlapiper.com
21 401 B Street, Suite 1700
22 San Diego, CA 92101-4297
23 Telephone: 619.699.2700
24 Facsimile: 619.699.2701

25 Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaim
26 Plaintiff SOPHOS INC. and Counterclaim
27 Plaintiff SOPHOS LTD.
28

SIGNATURE ATTESTATION

29 Pursuant to Local Rule 5.1(i)(3), I attest under penalty of perjury that concurrence in the filing
30 of this document has been obtained from David Knudson.

31 /s/ Grant N. Margeson
32

33 Grant N. Margeson
34
35
36
37
38

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

FORTINET, INC., a corporation

Case No. 3:13-cv-05831-EMC

Plaintiff,

vs.

SOPHOS, INC., a corporation, MICHAEL VALENTINE, an individual, and JASON CLARK, an individual.

Defendants.

SOPHOS INC. and SOPHOS LTD., corporations,

Counterclaim Plaintiffs,

vs.

FORTINET, INC., a corporation,

Counterclaim Defendant.

[PROPOSED] ORDER STAYING
CASE SCHEDULE FOR TWENTY (20)
DAYS

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED. The case is stayed for twenty (20) days until July 16, 2015.

Dated: 6/29, 2015 By: _____

